Justice to the Jesuits.

I.

UNDER this caption a novel defence of the Society of Jesus was announced some time ago. It has now appeared in a publication in which one should scarcely have looked for it: in the *Open Court* of Chicago (January, 1902), a magazine "devoted to the Science of Religion, the Religion of Science and the Extension of the Religious Parliament Idea." The article bears the title: "The Truth about the Jesuits," and is written by M. Henri de Ladevèze, a French writer. It is in many ways a remarkable *apologia* for the much-abused order. M. de Ladevèze begins as follows:

"From the first moment of their existence down to the present time, the Jesuits have had the privilege—or the misfortune—of being, in a greater or less degree, the subject of the constant preoccupation of public opinion. They are, nevertheless, very little and very incorrectly known, and I wish, in this article, to show them in their true light. Were they the lowest of men, they are yet entitled to a fair hearing. Is it not lamentable that in this age of criticism, at a time when so much is said about justice,—but at a time, alas! when justice is more applauded than practised—the Jesuits should still be represented as the black demons of fantastic legends, and that no accusation, however absurd and whatever its origin, has need of proof from the mere fact that it is levelled against them? There are, however, upright and independent thinkers, who exercise the right of private judgment, who are not influenced by the common-places that sway the vulgar mind. It is to them that I address myself; they will read these lines, as I have penned them, without prejudice." The author then briefly sketches the characteristic features of the organization of the Society; he proves "the Jesuitic code to be the very flower of Roman Catholic ethics and theology, and hence in every sence justified from a Roman point of view."

No one can blame the author for some slips in the explanation of the constitutions, as it is very difficult for one not familiar with the peculiar terminology of the rules of religious orders to grasp fully every detail. But he has endeavored to give a fair and unbiassed appreciation of the characteristics of the Society.

At the end of this outline the author says: "As may be judged from this too succinct but accurate sketch, the Society of Jesus is founded upon very wise and very liberal principles: very wise,

for there is but one authority, and I need not dwell on the advantages accruing from the fact; very liberal, since this authority emanates from the free choice of those who recognize it, and is never in danger of degenerating into tyranny, because it too is subject to the rule whose observance by all it is its special mission to secure."

Various charges against the Society are then examined: "What then is this rule which has provoked so much discussion? It is the same, in the main, as St. Benedict's, which has been adopted, with the modifications necessitated by the special object of each, by all religious orders since the sixth century. It is the same, consequently, in principle, as St. Basil's, and those which the Cenobites of the Egyptian and Syrian deserts followed under the leadership of such men as St. Anthony and St. Pacome, etc..... The Jesuits must obey their superiors; and has enough been said about this obedience? has indignation enough been poured out in torrents over the famous *perinde ac cadaver*, 'just as a dead body'? Now, leaving on one side military obedience, which is much more absolute, much less enlightened, and, above all, much less voluntary, note how St. Benedict, ten centuries before the Society of Jesus was founded, required his disciples to obey: 'Let no one in the monastery do his heart's will' (cap. 3). 'Monks do not live as they like, they follow neither their desires nor their inclinations, but they let themselves be led by the judgment of others' (cap. 5)....If St. Ignatius is the author of *perinde ac cadaver*, the formula only is his but not the idea. Let my readers judge for themselves. [St. Benedict says:] 'Not only have the monks no right to have their own wills in their possession, they have no right to possess even their bodies' (cap. 33).....In the army to which I have already alluded, can one imagine a soldier, an officer, remonstrating with his chiefs on the subject of a given command? [St. Ignatius allows his sons to do so if they are of a different opinion than their superiors, but then they have to acquiesce in their decision, recourse to higher superiors always being permitted.] And yet military obedience has had none but vigorous apologists, obedience in religious orders others than the Society of Jesus has had but rare and indulgent critics, while the obedience of the Jesuits has ever been the butt for attacks as numerous as..... my readers would not allow me to say impartial."....

The Jesuits are frequently styled ambitious. Our author disposes of this charge as follows: "The Jesuits observe a rule of the greatest severity. Without having the picturesque costume, without practising the extreme outward mortifications of monastic orders properly so called, the Jesuits apply themselves, more perhaps than all others, to inward mortification; and it is difficult

to understand the state of mind of a man who, having all the requisites of earthly happiness, knocks at the door of their novitiate. And yet youths, magistrates, priests, officers, noblemen, all classes of society, but especially the upper classes, furnish them with recruits, and, in Catholic countries especially, very few names that are found in the book of the Peerage, but are inscribed in theirs. How then is one to explain the accusations that are brought with such unrelenting animosity against religious who, if they are guilty, have certainly not yielded to personal motives in becoming so? For what could the motive be? Pecuniary advantage? But the greater number of the Jesuits belong to rich families and had to renounce their fortune to enter the Society. Ambition? But most of the Jesuits occupied enviable positions in the world, some having found them in their emblazoned cradles, others having won them by personal work and merit"....

We can not examine all the grievances alleged against the Jesuits. They resemble, as the author says, the mythological Proteus: they assume every variety of form and thus elude our grasp. There are numerous accusations made even by Catholics, or such who call themselves Catholics. Some of these assailants of the Society stoop so low as to repeat the slander of Pascal's '*Provincials.*' And yet, in the words of the Protestant Schöll, this publication is "a partisan book wherein prejudice attributes to the Jesuits suspected opinions they had long since condemned and which puts down to the account of the whole Society certain extravagances of a few Flemish and Spanish Fathers." Pascal attacks the moral theories of the Jesuits, above all their casuistry, which term has become a standing reproach to the Society. Mr. de Ladevèze makes a few observations on this point which some recent Catholic assailants of casuistry, and advocates of a "reform of moral theology," would do well to take cognizance of. " 'Casuistry,' as not a member of the Society of Jesus, but a member of the French Academy, M. F. Brunetière, excellently defines it, 'is the profound investigation and codification of the motives that must regulate conduct in those numerous and difficult cases in which duty finds itself in conflict, not with self-interest in the very least, but with duty itself.' And he adds: 'Those only can contest its necessity who, by a special gift of moral insensibility peculiar to themselves, have never lacked confidence in themselves and have never felt in the school of experience that life in this world is sometimes a very complicated affair. Another writer, a celebrated mathematician, the late M. J. Bertrand, who was also not a Jesuit, but was another member of the French Academy, does not fear to affirm that 'those who fight against casuistry, declare war against confession.' Pascal practised himself casuistry —and not the best sort—when he, in all his letters, attributed to

the casuists of the Society of Jesus only, the theses against which he protested, the greater number of which, if not all, date from before the foundation of the Society."

"The same may be said about Probabilism, which is inseparable from casuistry. To judge from what Pascal says, one would think that the Jesuits created it. But that is an error and an impossibility. It is an error, for Probabilism existed long before the establishment of the Society of Jesus. It is an impossibility, for Ignatius Loyola writes: 'Let no one emit a doctrine contrary either to the current opinions of the Schools or to the sentiments of the most authorized doctors, but let each accept those opinions on every subject which are most generally held.' In virtue of the very obedience with which they are reproached, the Jesuits could only be Probabilists from the fact that the most celebrated casuists taught Probabilism.... In any case, Pascal hurled his anathemas against Probabilism in vain; Rome did not imitate him.... this doctrine is still in vogue at the present time. I do not deny to Pascal the right of condemning it, but why expect the Jesuits to be more Catholic than the Pope?"

However, a Pope, Clement XIV., has suppressed the order. "Would such measures have been taken against innocent people?" M. de Ladevèze gives numerous quotations, which exhibit the true nature of this suppression. Thus the Protestant historian Schöll appreciates the Brief of suppression as follows: "This letter condemns neither the doctrine, nor the morals, nor the discipline of the Jesuits. The complaints of the courts against the order are the only motives alleged for its suppression." And the Archbishop of Paris wrote in 1774: "This Brief is pernicious, dishonoring to the tiara, and prejudicial to the glory of the Church." The author calls the suppression a crime. "The Jesuits have of course been accused of the Pope's death, an accusation all the more absurd when one reflects that, if they must at all costs be represented as knaves, they should at least not be taken for fools. Men, capable of not recoiling from murder, would have had recourse thereto before the Brief, not afterwards. They would have employed the same means to rid themselves of all their enemies. But far from so doing they bore all this injustice and all this suffering without flinching, without even a secret murmur."

M. de Ladevèze concludes: "A Jesuit is simply a Catholic, a priest, a religious, and we must confess that he is all three to a surpassing degree if we consider, belong to what communion we may, that the highest authority of the Roman Church, the Pope, is the most competent to pronounce on this point. Now, all the popes who, since Paul III., have had occasion to speak of the Society of Jesus, all, without excepting the one to whom they owed their momentary suppression, have done so in the most eulogistic

terms; they have vied one with another in loading this Society with the most comprehensive spiritual privileges; one and all have proclaimed it the most valiant troops, the bulwark of Catholicism. I do not mean to infer that we have not the right to judge the Jesuits from a different point of view to the popes,.....but all the reproaches with which we may feel entitled to load the Jesuits in the name of reason, of philosophy, etc., etc., fall equally upon all religious orders and upon the Church herself of which they have ever been the most brilliant ornament".....“If we consider them from a purely lay point of view, we are astonished at the services they have rendered, and at the number of distinguished men they have produced, in the space of three centuries, in tuition, in science and letters.".....“Shall we consider the Jesuits finally as private persons? There are very few amongst them, as everybody admits, who give any serious cause of complaint; no other body has ever counted so few unworthy members. It is always their spirit that is attacked. But I have already said that their spirit is the spirit of Catholicism whose best representatives they are. Let their opponents reproach them with being Catholics, if reproach them they must; but let those of us, who are conscious of the injustice of such a reproach, recognize the good in them; as to the rest let us remember that they are human, and therefore subject to the faults and failings we all share, but against which they strive far more constantly and efficaciously than do so large a number of ourselves, so large a number, above all, of those—the race shows no sign of extinction, alas!—who having expended all their severity upon others have nothing but unbounded indulgence at their disposal when it comes to dealing with themselves.”

[*To be concluded.*]

In commenting on the action of Eastern trunk lines in abolishing free passes on railway trains, George H. Heafford, lately General Passenger Agent of the Chicago, Milwaukee, & St. Paul R. R., says in a current magazine article, that, with a few exceptions, the sale of passage tickets does not much exceed the operating expenses and a total abolition of the free pass system—with its more or less corrupting influences—would add at least ten per cent. to the passenger earnings of every railway in the United States. Mr. Heafford declares the pass system to be practically an illegitimate (in some respects unlawful) bid for business or influence. While there are innumerable “deadheads,” he says the politicians of all parties, dominant or otherwise, are the greatest leeches upon railway companies, and thousands of cardboard tickets have in the past been placed where they would presumably do the most good for all concerned. That such a practice must prove a source of corruption is apparent, and the sooner it is abolished, the better it will be, not only for the railroads, but for the people at large.

The Holy Father on the Language Question.

On January 3rd the *Vaterland*, of Vienna, published an Apostolic letter of the Holy Father to the bishops of Bohemia and Moravia, in which he animadverts upon the language question, which causes so much disturbance in those countries. Leo XIII. writes:

"One cause of disunion, especially in Bohemia, may be traced to the languages which the inhabitants speak according to their different descent; for the inclination to love and protect the tongue inherited from his forebears is implanted by nature in every human being. We adhere to our determination to abstain from a decision of the controversies that have arisen over this matter. Surely the protection of the mother-tongue, so long as it does not exceed certain bounds, deserves no censure; provided always that the common interests of the State do not suffer. It is the duty of the rulers to preserve intact individual rights, in so far as it can be done without trenching on the welfare of the commonwealth. As for us, it is our duty to provide that religion be not jeopardized through such language controversies, for the faith is the chief good of the spirit and the source of all other goods."

We are glad to have our own position in the language question in this country thus confirmed by the Supreme Pontiff. More boldly than ever we shall uphold in the future, as we have in the past, these propositions, based on common sense and sanctioned by papal authority:

1. Religion is the supreme good. "*Salus animarum suprema lex.*"

2. So far as it is conducive, or at not least detrimental, to religion, individual rights ought to be sustained, especially that, implanted by nature, to speak and cherish the language of one's ancestors.

3. The exercise of this right is limited by the exigencies of public welfare.

Those American Catholics, therefore, who, no matter what their mother-tongue, endeavor to preserve it as a handmaid of their religion, without dreaming of erecting "a State within the State," or in any way interfering with the welfare of this free commonwealth, have nought to fear from Rome; on the contrary, they can look to the Apostolic See for protection of their rights if they are attacked within the fold.

Why are Ultra-National Parties Opposed to the Church?

T is a fact that parties or factions of an ultra-national tendency, for whose aspirations nationality is the Alpha and Omega, and which have no ideals or interests excepting on a national basis, show a more or less pronounced hostility to the Catholic Church, so much so that their names are often identical with enmity to the Church. This is true in the case of Germans, Slavs, and Italians; it is true even of nations that owe the preservation of their nationality to the Church alone and that became nations only through the Catholic Church.

The entire movement for the "unification" and "independence" of Italy was impregnated from the beginning with hatred for the Church and the papacy. In all the excesses of Magyarian chauvinism the lead is taken by anti-Catholic Liberalism together with a libertine Freemasonry and depraved Judaism. The Czech national party, that made the most noise and was the most intransigent, had for its characteristic note outspoken enmity to the Church. The liberal Slovenians are saturated with hatred for the Church and persecute unto death their fellow-citizens who are as loyal to the Church as to their nationality. The Ruthenians knew no better way to preserve their nationality than to amalgamate with the Russians, and by this very fact they became opponents to the Church. The ultra-German party in Austria has culminated in the "*Los von Rom*" movement.

Now what is the reason of this? It is simply this: Ultra-nationalism is nothing else but idolatry; instead of the one true God of revelation proclaimed by the Catholic Church it places nationality on the altar; this it adores in reality, this is its idol, and if mention is made of religion, it simply means religious forms adapted specifically to nationality and placed in its service. As nationality is something entirely terrestrial and temporal, such a national religion has nothing to do with eternity, and it is nothing else than a glittering ornamentation to the goddess nationality.

Obviously the Catholic Church can not admit or approve such worship of nationality, because it is in direct opposition to Christianity. Revelation teaches that even the best national and terrestrial goods do not equal the supernatural and eternal ones in value, but nationality is a circumstance purely natural and mundane, that is only of relative value to the Christian, and occupies its proper position only when it is made serviceable to religion. Extreme nationalism necessarily leads to national churches, therefore it is

the theoretical and practical negation of the Church of Christ. Finally it antagonizes the supreme law of love for our neighbor, because it seeks the promotion of one nationality without regard for others, and even advances the doctrine of inferior nations. Christianity gave the "idea of humanity" to the world; ultra-nationalism destroys this idea and according to ancient heathen ideas declares "foreigner" to be equivalent to "enemy" and "barbarian." National exclusion is irreconcilable with Catholic cosmopolitanism, and this explains the hostility of the ultra-nationalists to the Church.

We are justified therefore, in pronouncing the extravagant nationalism of our day a heresy, yea, a relapse into ancient paganism. The extreme nationalist cares more for his nationality than for the Church, in fact, he is *eo ipso* an enemy of the Church, because she is international by the will of her Divine Founder and by her very nature. But not only that, the extreme nationalism of our age is a relapse into paganism, because it does away with positive religion and at most looks upon God as a national God.

From the Christian view-point we must not only deplore such an aberration of sound common sense, but we must condemn it as totally opposed to the Christian religion. Ultra-nationalism is directly opposed to the principles of the Christian religion and morals, and is a consequence of that blind pride and vanity that sees only virtues and perfections in one's own nationality, and nothing but defects, faults, and vices in others.

The man who attempted to kill himself by jumping in front of a trolley car the other day is evidently destined for a different end. He threw himself from the platform of the car directly in front of the wheels, but by what may be regarded as a miracle the fender "worked" and he was saved. He immediately sprang in front of another car and was run over, but when he was picked up he was only stunned and soon came to his senses, such as he had, and walked away without satisfying his desire to die or the curiosity of the throng that had gathered about him. He has perhaps an even greater dislike for this world now than he had before his attempts, and it is indeed cruel when a world will neither make your life a happy one nor allow you to quit it when you would. This man appears to be a victim of contraries. Perhaps in his discouragement he will give up the idea of dying altogether, go to work at some useful occupation, and become a prosperous and contented citizen, who will shudder whenever he thinks of these rash attempts and thank God that life was spared him. And then he will get off a car and fail to "look out for the car passing in the opposite direction," the fender will *not* work, and there will be a long-delayed funeral. 'Tis a hard world!

CONTEMPORARY CHRONICLE.

THE RELIGIOUS WORLD.

Warning Against a Certain Kind of Pious Literature.—The Louvain correspondent of the Portland *Catholic Sentinel*, Fr. van der Heyden, reports under date of Dec. 14th, that the Belgian bishops have issued a joint circular in which religious periodicals are forbidden henceforth to designate, except in a general way, spiritual favors or miraculous graces obtained through the intercession of some saint, whose devotion is sought to be spread, or to give the names of persons contributing money in thanksgiving for a favor secured or as an alms to secure such. Fr. van der Heyden tells us that this timely episcopal interference meets with general approval, because there has grown up of late years in Belgium a pious literature of a kind that does more harm than good; and he recalls the timely warning of Dupanloup, which he rightly says is applicable to-day not only to France and Belgium, but to our own United States as well: "Be on your guard against certain kinds of pious literature. The book trade, not sufficiently watched, throws every year upon the market thousands of books of piety lacking in doctrine and solidity, full of inaccurate notions, of exaggerations and false statements, which debase religion and pervert devotion."

The "Living Way of the Cross."—The Sacred Congregation of Indulgences, by a decree dated August 16th, 1901, has empowered the General of the Franciscan Order and the provincials of the various provinces to establish for their respective jurisdictions the "Living Way of the Cross," a devotion constructed upon the model of the "Living Rosary." Any fourteen persons can form a "Living Way of the Cross," each one obliging himself to meditate daily on one station allotted to him, and to recite three Our Fathers, Hail Marys, and Glory be to the Father, etc. To this devotion are attached the indulgences ordinarily connected with the Stations of the Cross, besides other special favors.

Growth of the Church.—The *Independent* (No. 2771) gives figures on the growth of the Catholic Church during the past century, which force even this bitterly Protestant journal to the confession that "while the population of the world has about doubled, the Catholic Church has quite held its own proportionally and under missionary labors and immigration has made even larger gains."

The Holy Father's Activity.—The Rome correspondent of the *Tablet* (No. 3212) relates a striking instance of the venerable Pontiff's direct activity in the every-day affairs of the Church. A bishop was to be nominated for a certain see which has been vacant for some time. The selection seemed to be a foregone conclusion. Priests, bishops, primate, and the cardinals of the curia had all united unanimously upon a certain churchman, but when the Secretary of the Propaganda presented the name to the Holy Father for the mere formality, as he thought, of the pontifical approbation, Pope Leo shook his head. "No, no," he said, "N—— N——

shall go to that see, but your candidate is absolutely indispensable where he is." Quite recently, too, the Holy Father held out strongly against the appointment of Msgr. Kelly, as coadjutor to the Cardinal Archbishop of Sydney, and only yielded when he had convinced himself fully that Msgr. Kelly was necessary for Sydney, and not necessary for the Irish College. The Holy Father's interest in the national colleges in Rome has always been very marked—and is still as marked as ever. Lately he instituted a personal investigation into the management of one of these colleges (not an English or English speaking one) and finding that matters were not running with the perfect order he has always insisted upon, he ordered the removal of the rector, and refused to relent when Cardinal —— interceded for the doomed superior.

OUR ISLAND POSSESSIONS

The Philippine Friar Question.—It appears to be settled that a portion at least of the friars in the Philippine Islands are to be replaced by American priests. For the training of the missionaries that will be required for this new field, a despatch in the daily papers says that a seminary is to be established in Washington, under the direction of the Paulist Fathers. Doubts have been expressed in at least one Catholic newspaper whether the Paulists are able and fit to continue the work of the old orders in a field in which the "Weylerism" of the American government is apt to arouse against them much the same prejudices which are about to result in the withdrawal of the Spanish religious from those unhappy islands.

We understand Msgr. Sbarretti has been instructed to do his best to retain as many of the Spanish friars as possible. The sentiment at Washington seems to be that all of them ought to go. The government is to purchase their land holdings by floating thirty-year bonds, and to dispose of them in such a way as to secure a refund of its expenditure.

The situation will probably be cleared up in the near future by a bull of the Holy Father.

EDUCATION.

State Paternalism in Public Education.—Paternalism in public education is gradually working toward its logical end. The Findlay, O., Public School Board is said to be considering the scheme of prescribing a uniform to be worn by the pupils of the institutions under its jurisdiction. Of course, this educational improvement will be at the cost of the public taxes.

Failure of Compulsory Education in Holland.—The compulsory education law in Holland has now been in operation one year, and the attendance is less than before. In other words, the law has proved a failure. This is attributed to the fact that nearly all the parents availed themselves of the general permission given by the law to keep their children at home for six weeks in the harvest season. Before the passage of the law it was forbidden in most parishes to employ children in the fields during school hours.

Need of Catholic Juvenile Reform Schools.—Judge Tuthill, Presiding Justice of the Chicago Juvenile Court, was recently (Nov. 13th)

quoted in the *Chronicle* as saying that Chicago's crying need is a juvenile reform school; his long experience having taught him that it is next to impossible to save the boys from evil influences when parents continue to turn them adrift on the streets. There are a few such institutions in Chicago now, but it appears they are entirely inadequate.

Rev. Father J. F. Meifuss writes us that about the time the above-quoted article was printed in the Chicago *Chronicle*, he was appointed, with the permission of his ordinary, probation officer for two poor Catholic waifs under the same law under which the Chicago Juvenile Court works. To provide a suitable place for the boy he applied to the institutions at Feehanville and Schermerville only to learn that they were not reform schools. Further researches led him to the conclusion that there is no institution in all the great State of Illinois, except the over-crowded State reformatories, where a wayward boy can be placed for correction. Feehanville having been rebuilt by the generosity of the Catholics of Chicago, and Schermerville erected with the help of Illinois Catholics in general, could it not be brought about that either of these institutions erect an annex for Catholic youths of the criminal class, to save hundreds from eternal ruin? Chicago furnishes the great majority of youthful criminals in the State; could not its St. Vincent de Paul conferences take this matter in hand? We are sure the Catholics in the State at large would gladly aid in the erection of a Catholic reform school.

LITERATURE.

Mrs. Eddy and Bob Ingersoll, or Christian Science Tested. By Rev. C. Van der Donckt. 1901. 97 pages. [For sale by B. Herder, St. Louis, Mo., 30 cents.]

"Christian Science," the latest and most dangerous superstition, is spreading more and more. Even some Catholic have been beguiled, probably the more easily as this new error appears *sub specie boni*, under pretence of confidence in prayer; it is "the Evil One transformed into an angel of light," hence all the more insidious. The disciples of Mrs. Eddy often maintain that their tenets are in no way antagonistic to Christianity. Father Van der Donckt ably proves that the fundamental principles of Mrs. Eddy's system are the same as some of the blasphemies of Ingersoll and that the Trinity, the Divinity of Christ, free will, sin and hell and other doctrines of the Christian religion are denied by this false prophetess. It is important to instruct the people that "Christian Science" is neither science, nor Christian, but a hypocritical, pernicious, and ridiculous movement. Father Van der Donckt's book, therefore, is a timely publication. It is written in clever and sprightly dialogues, and deserves the widest circulation among all classes.

——In the *Catholic World* Magazine for December, Rev. Dr. James J. Fox proved by means of the "deadly parallel column," that two volumes—and at least three-fourths of the other two—of Father Thein's 'The Bible and Rationalism,' are nothing else but Vigouroux's '*La Bible et les Découvertes Modernes*' done into atrocious and frequently unintelligible English. All the glaring de-

fects of the four portly volumes belong to Father Thein, while all the excellences belong to the Abbé Vigouroux. We have seen no defense from Father Thein against these serious charges. If they are true, as we fear they are, Dr. Fox deserves the thanks of the Catholic public for having exposed a clerical impostor.

OBITUARY.

Prof. F. X. Kraus.—On Dec. 29th, 1901, there died at San Remo, in Italy, Professor Dr. F. X. Kraus, author of many learned works, chief of which a '*Geschichte der Christlichen Kunst.*' Whilst the Catholic public generally welcomed what Kraus wrote on art, few were satisfied with his other writings on account of his pronounced Liberalism. Thus Msgr. Joseph Schröder wrote against the Church History of Kraus his essay, '*Der Liberalisms in der Theologie und Geschichte*' and had the satisfaction to see the whole first edition withdrawn from the market. The new edition had to have the approval of the Index Congregation before it was published. The latest work of Kraus was a booklet on Cavour, in which he showed himself to the last as the "*Professore catolico spirito liberale*," as the Italian Minister of worship, R. Bonghi, had called him. Kraus was a great friend of our Liberal lights. His literary activity, except in the realm of art, has been pernicious to the Catholic cause, according to the unanimous judgment of the Catholic press of Germany. His "Spectator" letters in the scientific supplement of the Munich *Allgemeine Zeitung*, a radically anti-Catholic newspaper, were largely scandalous and wrought immense harm. May his soul find greater mercy with God than he found with his opponents here below. *R. I. P.*

INSURANCE.

The Independent Order of Foresters.—From the November number of the *Forester*, organ of the Independent Order of Foresters, which fell into our hands by accident the other day, we see that that organization has now 187,000 members and boasts of a surplus of $5,142,066. The I. O. F. insures at the rate of $13.54 per $1,000 at age thirty. No wonder it is making frantic endeavors to spread all over the world, even to far-off Australia, and announces as a new means of securing new members, temporary "dispensation" from registration and certificate fees. But all this catch-penny business and the order's parade of tinsel (Chief Ranger, Court, Supreme Secretary, etc.) does not put money in the treasury. To contribute the cost of insurance or else accept fragmentary insurance is still the inexorable alternative. In view of the order's reputation in this country, and especially in Canada, we are surprised to see a Catholic paper, the Sydney *Catholic Press*, lending its aid to establish the I. O. F. on Australian soil.

Reckoning Day.—We note from the *Independent* that the Maryland Insurance Commissioner has refused to license the Mutual Reserve for 1902 and has written an explanatory letter of considerable length. He has for months been receiving complaints and enquiries and cites one case which he investigated. One E. D. Buckman took out several policies in the Mutual Reserve in May of

1885, starting with bi-monthly assessments of $3.75 per $1,000. In two years this assessment rose to $5,63 ; in 1895 it was $9.03 ; in 1898 it was $15.50 ; 1899 it was $18.47 ; in 1900 it was $20.04 ; in 1901 it was $21.76, or $130.56 per year for $1,000. According to a table furnished, says the Commissioner, another five years will call upon Buckman for $1,000 more (he having already paid $2,-800), and if he dies within a short time a lien of $455.60, as he has been notified, will be deducted from his policy.

Such is the inevitable fate of our "cheap" mutuals ; and yet when one dies, another takes its place on a plan perhaps even wilder than that of the defunct concern. Before us we have the *Farmers' Vindicator* of Dec. 27th, giving the outline of a new "Equitable Union," chartered in Kansas, that will continue "the two great coöperative systems : that of home building and home protection," all for a mere song. Let our readers in Kansas compare the assessment rates of this new concern with the table of "Accountant" in Vol. VIII, No. 30, of THE REVIEW. They will see at once that the "reckoning day" of the "Equitable Union" can not be far off.

SCIENCE AND INDUSTRY.

Wireless Telegraphy.—Msgr. Laflamme, writing on Marconi's experiments in *La Vérité* of Quebec (No. 23), takes a somewhat skeptical view of recent reports and gives it as his opinion that even if they are literally true, it will be a long time before wireless telegraphy will replace the system now in use, especially on land. The apparatus are by no means as simple as is generally believed and their installation and regulation much more complicated and laborious than that of the Morse machiness and wire lines. Moreover, they are subject to numerous disturbances incident to terrestrial and electric currents, differences in temperature, etc. The great drawbacks of wireless telegraphy are, according to two of the most eminent living authorities on the subject, Messrs. Boulanger and Ferrier, 1. Insecurity of communication : 2. The necessity of erecting poles at an enormous height if long distances are to be covered ; 3. The cumbersomeness and delicacy of the instruments employed. The first of these obstacles is so great that, as Fr. de Laak of St. Louis University has already pointed out [see our vol. viii, p. 616], it is almost impossible under present conditions to remove the danger of diversion or interception.

Msgr. Laflamme also points out that Marconi, contrary to an almost universal opinion, is not the inventor of wireless telegraphy, but only an apt pupil of such men as Lodge, Popof, Righi, Hertz, and Branly, and that he himself has acknowledged his indebtedness to the latter by addressing to him at Paris the first wireless despatch sent across the Channel by the aid of Hertzian waves.

POLITICS AND SOCIOLOGY.

The Capital Punishment Question in the Netherlands.—The new Dutch Minister of Justice has aroused dissatisfaction by his refusal to advocate the re-introduction of capital punishment, which as a Christian he acknowledges to be legitimate and justifiable in principle. Meanwhile the number of homicides in the country is steadily increasing.

THE STAGE.

A Word of Warning.—Rev. P. Antonine Wilmer, O. M. Cap., Rector of St. Lawrence College, Mt. Calvary, Wis., writes us: "There being such a scarcity of unobjectionable comedies, some of your reverend readers in charge of young men's societies may welcome the list of comedies advertised in the *Homiletic Monthly*. If, trusting in the reliability of that magazine, they should order these plays, they will be sorely disappointed. Among the twenty-four plays for young men they will find eleven with female characters, though the list is headed in bold type: "Male Characters Only." Father Wilmer sends us a list of the plays. They are advertised for sale by the publisher of the *Homiletic Monthly*, Joseph F. Wagner, 103 Fifth Ave., New York, who ought to have a better care of his reputation for veracity.

MUSIC.

Who is to Blame?—A pastor of the Cleveland Diocese thinks that Cardinal Satolli, in his explanation regarding Church music (see No. 38, p. 605 of the last volume of THE REVIEW) puts the blame in the wrong place. Not the people are chiefly to blame, in our reverend correspondent's opinion, nor the singers, but the pastors. "I have been a pastor for over twenty-six years," he says, "and though I have always set aside the operatic style of Church music, I have never heard a word of disapproval or complaint from the people. The people, as a rule, go to church because they have learned the obligation from their catechism, and the great majority of them are well pleased to hear devout singing rather than profane and operatic melodies. It is also a mistake to think that the churches would be deserted if the present florid style of music would be abolished. There are plenty of good Cecilian melodies which are florid and possess more real musical beauty than the operatic masses now in vogue." There are those in the Church of God, concludes our correspondent, whose sacred duty it is to keep everything unholy and profane out of the house of God. Let them do their duty.

MEDICINE.

Vaccination.—*La Vérité* of Quebec (No. 24) strongly protests against compulsory vaccination, which appears to have been introduced in a few towns in the Province of Quebec. Compulsory vaccination, according to our contemporary, is under present conditions not only an act of insufferable tyranny, but veritable folly from the scientific view-point, inasmuch as the malady which it is calculated to prevent is incontestably less grave than that which it inoculates. Mr. Tardivel, after quoting a note from our issue of Dec. 19th, adds that, while there has not been "a massacre of innocents" at Quebec, such as there was in St. Louis, Camden, Milan, and other places, the recent vaccination craze there has undeniably produced numerous and serious accidents.

MISCELLANY.

The Legend of the Holy House of Loretto and a Certain College Paper.—The following notes from an esteemed and learned colaborer reached us too late for insertion in last week's issue :

The *St. Mary's Sentinel*, published by the students of St. Mary's College, Kentucky, in the December number, lectured the editor of THE REVIEW on account of his attitude towards the legend of the Holy House of Loretto. The students of St. Mary's College write : "*We* venture to express our disapproval :.... *we* think this pious legend should be defended, etc." It is certainly not worth while to defend THE REVIEW against these juvenile critics. However, it might not be useless to give them advice which they seem sadly to need. "Dear boys, don't write about things of which you are not capable to judge." That one sentence : "We are shocked to read that Mr. Preuss whose glory it is to be *inter Romanos Romanissimus*, should advocate anything so derogatory to the honor and vigilance of the Roman Pontiffs," proves that they are utterly ignorant of the real nature of the whole question. They should study Father Grisar's lecture (THE REVIEW, May 23rd, 1901), and the articles : "Historical Criticism and the Catholic Mind" (THE REVIEW, July 25th, 1901), and "Historical Criticism and the Spirit of Charity" (THE REVIEW, Dec. 12th, 1901). From these articles the youthful writers may learn—provided they are able to grasp the arguments,—that their "theological" misgivings are altogether groundless. In the article of December 12th, they will also find themselves faithfully described among those that pass rash judgments on Catholic historians.

I can not help expressing my surprise at the fact that the faculty of St. Mary's College allows the students to discuss publicly and in a most dogmatical manner, questions which present difficulties even to theologians. The *St. Mary's Sentinel* is not the only college paper that dabbles in questions which are far beyond the ken of college boys. Supposing that these articles are written by the boys—for I do not want to assume that others dishonestly use the editorial part of these magazine for uttering their own opinions,—I find such practice objectionable from a pedagogical point of view. Complaints are often heard about self-conceit, priggishness, and superciliousness of our young people. Now the *Sentinel*, with the emphatic, self-possessed "*we*," boldly contradicts not the editor of THE REVIEW, but the authors on whose statements he bases his own, such Catholic scholars as Father Grisar, S. J., Professor Funk, and numerous other distinguished historians. Writings like that of the *Sentinel* are only too apt to develop in our youths the aforesaid unamiable qualities. Besides the youthful critics charge distinguished Catholic scholars with disloyalty to the Holy Father, by calling their views "derogatory to the honor of the Roman Pontiffs." *We* were told by our teachers not to talk about matters which we did not understand ; *we* heard often, *he sutor ultra crepidam; we* were told to speak respectfully of older people and their intellectual achievements.

I gladly seize this apportunity to say that the opinion expressed by THE REVIEW on the matter of pious legends, is shared by many prominent ecclesiastics, by men who are no less known for their

piety and devotion to the Church than for their learning. You may be sure that the writers of the articles published in THE REVIEW on this subject, knew full well what they think in Rome of the present movement. In Rome it is not considered "derogatory to the honor and vigilance of the Roman Pontiffs." The editor of THE REVIEW may be proud of being styled "*Romanissimus inter Romanos*," but he need not and ought not to be more Roman than the Romans themselves. If Rome does not condemn those historians who labor for the glory of the Church, how, then, can any Catholic dare to censure them? They are certainly as devoted to the glory of Mary and the honor of the Roman Pontiffs as the men who anxiously try to uphold the pious legends.

For the rest, it may be better to drop the discussion of this subject until the documents have been published. The articles in THE REVIEW have accomplished their object. First they have prepared the Catholics for what sooner or later must be published, not only about the Holy House of Loretto, but also about several other legends. Secondly, they have warned the Catholics to be cautious with regard to medieval legends in general, and not to attribute to them a weight which they do not deserve. Thirdly, and this is the most important gain, they have proved that there is and ought to be a very great difference in the attitude of Catholics towards what is accidental and merely ornamental in the Church, viz., pious legends—and what is essential, viz., the contents of the inspired writings and the infallible teaching of the Church.

Journalism as a Vocation.—William Cullen Bryant, the poet, in an article prepared in 1851 for the semi-centennial number of the N. Y. *Evening Post*, of which he was the editor, spoke thus of journalism as a vocation:

"An experience of a quarter of a century in the conduct of a newspaper should suffice to give one a pretty complete idea of the effect of journalism upon the character. It is a vocation which gives an insight into men's motives, and reveals by what influences masses of men are moved, but it shows the dark rather than the bright side of human nature, and one who is not disposed to make due allowances for the peculiar circumstances in which he is placed is apt to be led by it into the mistake that the large majority of mankind are knaves. It brings one perpetually in sight, at least, of men of various classes, who make public zeal a cover for private interest, and desire to avail themselves of the influence of the press for the prosecution of their own selfish projects. It fills the mind with a variety of knowledge relating to the events of the day, but that knowledge is apt to be superficial, since the necessity of attending to many subjects prevents the journalist from thoroughly investigating any. In this way it begets desultory habits of thought, disposing the mind to be satisfied with mere glances at difficult questions, and to dwell only upon plausible commonplaces."

Touching for the King's Evil.—King's evil was the old English name for scrofula, and it was believed to be cured by the royal touch. We are reminded in the latest volume of the 'Oxford Dictionary' that the practice lasted till the end of Anne's reign in 1714, and the office for the ceremony was printed in the Prayer-Book down to 1719.